



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,725	04/13/2006	Koichi Hasegawa	2006_0570A	1683
513	7590	11/09/2010		
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.			EXAMINER	
1030 15th Street, N.W.,			MORELLO, JANELL COMBS	
Suite 400 East				
Washington, DC 20005-1503			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1733	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
11/09/2010	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com
eo@wenderoth.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/575,725	Applicant(s) HASEGAWA ET AL.
	Examiner Janelle Morillo	Art Unit 1733

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2010.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 17-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-20 and 22-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 21 and 26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/88/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant traverses the restriction, and argues he never received an office action on the merits. However, the examiner points out the restriction was made due to the 'consisting of' closed claim language vs. original 'composed of' claim language, and claim 21 was a comprehensive claim (covers the scope of previously pending claims, unlike cl. 17-20). Accordingly, claims 17-20, 22-25 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hensel (US 2,450,340) in view of Croce (US 6,841,012).

Hensel teaches an alloy for metal evaporation, for coating a thin film (column 2 lines 11-12, 18-19). Hensel teaches a silver alloy with added phosphorus, and in particular, containing (in weight%): 0.001-1% P, 0.25-20% Pt and Pd, 0.001-0.5% Ni, Co, and Fe (column 1 lines 47-55), which overlaps the ranges of P, Pt, Pd, Ni, Fe in instant claim 21, including the amended ranges of P and Cu, Ni, Fe, or Bi. The prior art of Hensel does not teach the mandatory addition of any additional elements excluded by the closed "consisting of" transitional phrase. Though Hensel

does not mention the purity of the silver or the purity of the added elements, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used high purity starting materials, in order to obtain a low impurity level Ag alloy with predictable behavior.

Hensel does not teach the addition of In, Sn, or Zn. However, Croce teaches that >0 to 1% In is included in Ag alloys in order to provide the predictable purpose of improving ductility and casting of the alloy (column 4 lines 6-7). Alternatively, Hensel teaches >0-2% Sn is added to Ag alloys in order to improve hardness and ductility of the alloy (column 4 line7-9). Hensel teaches >0-5% Zn adds to the whiteness of the alloy (column 4 line 4). Croce teaches ranges of In, Zn, and Sn that overlap the amended ranges. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have added In, Sn, and/or Zn to the Ag alloy taught by Hensel, because Croce teaches that the addition of said elements have various beneficial predictable results (as discussed above).

Overlapping ranges have been held to be a *prima facie* case of obviousness, see MPEP § 2144.05. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any portion of the range, including the claimed range, from the broader range disclosed in the prior art, because the prior art finds that said composition in the entire disclosed range has a suitable utility. Additionally, "The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages," *In re Peterson*, 65 USPQ2d at 1379 (CAFC 2003).

Concerning claim 26, as stated above, Hensel teaches forming a thin film of said alloy.

Response to Amendment/Arguments

4. In the response filed on 8/19/2010 applicant amended claim 21. The examiner agrees that no new matter has been added.

5. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 8/19/10 (together with the declaration filed 11/10/2009) is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 21 and 26 based upon Hensel as set forth in the last Office action because: the examiner agrees that declarant has shown examples that fall within the claimed invention exhibit unexpected results with respect to comparative examples. The examiner agrees that declarant has shown a selection of alloys, representative of the instantly claimed alloying ranges, together with a statement in said declaration that "Examples 6-1 to 6-8 are representative of the claimed scope". The examiner submits that "the claimed scope" consists of the claims (namely 21 and 26) as amended on 8/19/2010, submitted with said declaration.

6. However, point b) in the previous office action has not been addressed. Declarant has not established a nexus between the closest prior art of Hensel and the comparative examples.

Further concerning b), evidence of unexpected properties may be in the form of a direct or indirect comparison of the claimed invention with the closest prior art which is commensurate in scope with the claims. See *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980) and MPEP §716.02(d) - § 716.02(e). With respect to said indirect comparison, applicant a) may compare the claimed invention with prior art that is more closely related to the invention than the prior art relied upon by the examiner, *In re Holladay*, 584 F.2d 384, 199 USPQ 516 (CCPA 1978); *Ex parte Humber*, 217 USPQ 265 (Bd. App. 1961), or b) show criticality of the instant range. To establish unexpected results over a claimed range, applicants should compare a sufficient number of tests both inside and outside the claimed range to show the criticality of the claimed range. *In re Hill*, 284 F.2d 955, 128 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1960).

In the instant case, declarant has not stated (in a 1.132 declaration) that the comparative example (4-2) is closer to the claimed invention than the closest example of Hensel (column 1 lines 39-42- 0.04% P, 4.97% Pt, balance Ag). Therefore, applicant has not clearly shown unexpected results with respect to the closest prior art of Hensel.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janelle Morillo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1240. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am- 6:00 pm Mon-Wed.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. M./

Examiner, Art Unit 1733

November 3, 2010

/ Roy King/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1733